



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 110

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 1964

No. 124

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:
Philippians 4: 19: *But my God shall supply all your need according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus.*

Eternal God, our Father, who art acquainted with our many needs and canst supply them all, give us the faith that trusts and commits itself humbly and heroically to Thy guidance in these confused and troubled times.

Grant that the leaders and Members of this legislative body may be endowed with that wisdom which will enable them to bring to fulfillment all those noble aspirations which Thou hast planted within the soul of humanity.

Show us how we may banish from the mind and heart of man those attitudes which are alien to the spirit of our blessed Lord and at variance with His teachings of the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

APPROVAL OF WORK PLANS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

JUNE 18, 1964.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State, watershed, executive communication, and committee approval:
Mississippi, Bear-Tilda Bogue, No. 1801, June 16, 1964.

Arizona, Buckeye, No. 2043, June 16, 1964.
Oklahoma, Lower Bayou, No. 2043, June 16, 1964.
Oklahoma, Upper Bayou, No. 2043, June 16, 1964.

Oklahoma, Okmulgee Creek, No. 2043, June 16, 1964.

South Dakota, Turkey Ridge Creek, No. 2043, June 16, 1964.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FURTHER TRAVEL TO CUBA, CONTRARY TO OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS, BY U.S. STUDENTS EVIDENCES CLEARLY THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, grist for the Communist propaganda mill is being ground out by U.S. citizens, so-called students, now visiting in Cuba, contrary to our best interests and to the U.S. travel ban to that country.

The statement of an American student, an admitted Communist, Edward Lemanski, of New York, according to the Washington Post article of this date, which I place in the RECORD at this point, states as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 19, 1964]

STUDENT WANTS CUBA IDEAS HERE

HAVANA.—The leader of a group of 75 American students visiting Cuba in defiance of a State Department ban said today that the visitors want to take socialism back to their country.

"We want to know the correct methods used here as well as your mistakes to be well prepared to take socialism to our country," said Edward Lemanski, 23, of New York.

Lemanski said he donated to a Cuban blood bank yesterday because "my Government is responsible for the loss of much Cuban blood and I want to give back the Cuban people

some of that lost blood * * * several others here think the same way."

Yvonne Bond, of San Francisco, said her blood donation represented to her "my biggest antimperialist gesture. I want it used in some Cuban wounded fighting against any eventual attack by the United States."

All of the students in the group donated blood except Scott Wilson, 16, of San Francisco, who was under the minimum donor's age. He called Communist Cuba "a wonderful thing."

Judy Chessman, of New York, who said she was a City College student, said her blood donation was in gratitude to the Cuban people.

Mr. Lemanski made this statement when he arrived in Cuba in a radio interview.

The article above states that the American students visiting Cuba in defiance of a State Department ban said today that the visitors want to take socialism back to their country.

I am placing at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba, signed "Fraternally, the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba."

The letter follows:

STUDENT COMMITTEE FOR
TRAVEL TO CUBA,
New York, N.Y., June 1, 1964.

DEAR FRIEND: Because of space limitations on available transport to Cuba we have had to cut down considerably on the number we can take this year. Knowing how many people were counting on going made the task of selection an unpleasant one. We were not able to make a final list earlier as we were waiting for the number of candidates from the area representatives around the country. Frequently we were forced to conform to regional quotas, age, and other impersonal factors in making our decisions. We are sorry that you can't be included.

We know that all those who made applications were committing themselves to the struggle against the travel ban and the isolation of Cuba, and we appreciate the integrity and courage motivating this commitment.

The attack that we are making against our Government's policy is just beginning to gain momentum, and we are planning other trips and political activity to further our goals. We hope that you are interested in participating in these activities.

13901

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

13902

As soon as possible, we will refund your deposit.

Fraternally,

THE STUDENT COMMITTEE FOR
TRAVEL TO CUBA.

I testified today before the House Immigration Subcommittee on two bills which I have introduced which have as their objective tightening up the loopholes that prevent the Government of the United States from properly enforcing its travel ban to Communist countries from which we have withdrawn recognition, and in particular with relation to Cuba. I think this is one of the most vital issues facing the Congress of the United States, and I am hopeful that the committee will take proper action on the legislation proposed.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony I gave before the Immigration Subcommittee today is as follows:

TESTIMONY BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM C. CRAMER, OF FLORIDA, BEFORE THE HOUSE IMMIGRATION SUBCOMMITTEE, JUNE 19, 1964, IN BEHALF OF HIS BILLS, H.R. 11603 AND H.R. 5320

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to testify in support of legislation which has, as its ultimate goal, the purpose of implementing the express policy of the State Department's ban on travel to Cuba and other countries with which we do not have diplomatic relations and in which travel is contrary to our interests.

In support of this legislation, I intend to exhibit the clear need for its passage, the present activities and backgrounds of some of the people it is aimed at, and the type of legislation which I believe will do the job.

Through a press release dated June 29, 1961, apparently aware of the number of U.S. citizens traveling to Cuba illegally, the State Department publicly announced the following:

"On January 16, 1961, the Department of State publicly announced that all U.S. citizens desiring to travel to Cuba must obtain passports specifically endorsed for such travel by the Department.

"The Department has recently received information that some U.S. citizens are being encouraged to travel to Cuba via Central or South America without complying with the passport requirements.

"Travel to Cuba by a U.S. citizen, without a passport specifically validated by the Department for that purpose, constitutes a violation of the travel control law and regulations (title 8, United States Code).

"The Department warns all concerned that a willful violation of the law is punishable by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both."

On April 3, 1963, in testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, I introduced into the record of that subcommittee, a list of 99 American citizens, many with Communist backgrounds, who traveled to Cuba illegally. The list only covered 9 months in 1962.

I also introduced into the record of that subcommittee advertisements which appeared in the Worker and the National Guardian wherein people openly advertised the fact that they went to Cuba. They returned to this country and were making speeches and showing films glorifying the Communist revolution in Cuba.

What do some of these people do when they get to Cuba?

This is answered by CIA Director John A. McCone who, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, on pages 65 and 66 of the printed hearings, stated the following:

"At least 1,000 to 1,500 persons came to Cuba during 1962, from all other Latin American countries with the possible exception of Uruguay to receive ideological indoctrination or guerrilla warfare training or both. More have gone in 1963 despite the limited facilities for reaching Cuba at present."

And, the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, following its hearings on "Castro Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere" said, in part:

"International Soviet agents, experts in the field of revolutionary propaganda, terrorist tactics, and guerrilla warfare, are operating schools for violence in Cuba, training and indoctrinating Latin American subversives. The Soviet Union as well as its Cuban puppet regime must bear the responsibility and consequences for subversive attacks on nations of the Western Hemisphere."

I might point out that, at the time the committee reported its findings, it apparently wasn't aware that included in the list of subversives traveling to and from Cuba were U.S. citizens. I say this despite the fact that, as evidenced by their press release of June 29, 1961, the State Department was well aware of the illegal travel of U.S. citizens to Cuba.

Subsequent to all of the above testimony and committee findings, a large group of American students, under the name of the "Permanent Student Committee for Travel to Cuba," ventured to Cuba, met with Castro, applauded when films were shown of American pilots being shot down in Vietnam, and then thumbed their noses at our laws when they returned. Many of us were present when, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, these students showed their contempt for the Congress and their country.

To date, although it is against both the announced policy of the State Department and the law to travel to Communist Cuba and other countries such as Red China, the Justice Department has not been able to get one single conviction.

The one conviction the United States did get was reversed by the U.S. Court of Appeals, fifth circuit, on February 20, 1964. This was the case of *U.S. v. Worthy* (328 F. 2d 386, 1964) in which Worthy visited Cuba and then returned to this country without a valid passport.

The difficulty in getting convictions is the problem of establishing the traveler's intent to visit Cuba when he leaves the United States. In most instances, these people enter another country such as Mexico and then travel to Cuba.

Thus, it is claimed, they did not plan to visit Cuba when they left the United States but decided upon it after they reached another country.

Were these people who travel to Cuba a harmless and innocent group of young Americans seeking adventure, my fears would not be so great. But such is not the case.

Most of these people are carefully trained by persons whose avowed aim is to turn the minds of our Nation's youth against the policies and national interests of the United States. Many of the young people in this drive are recruited directly from our college campuses. The majority of them are probably dupes, unaware of what they're doing or whose goals they are furthering.

Nevertheless, dupes, or not, they are serving purposes alien to those of this country and effective laws should be put on the books whereby the leaders can be convicted and this practice brought to a halt.

I should emphasize that the problem of U.S. citizens traveling to countries illegally is not isolated to travel to Cuba. The most recent known group of so-called students to travel to forbidden countries went behind the Bamboo Curtain. They

were two Puerto Rican students, Rabel Martinez, and Maria Sanchez Olmeda.

Both are members of FUPI (Federation of University Students), an organization which openly espouses strong, anti-American sympathies.

These students met with Mao Tse-tung, participated in a Communist youth movement in Budapest, toured North Vietnam, and North Korea.

In Peiping on March 30, these students issued a joint statement with the All-China Students Federation stating that both the Chinese and Puerto Rican students "will strengthen their unity and the cooperation between their organization in the common struggle against U.S. imperialism."

The joint statement also said: "The great Cuban revolution pointed out a correct path to national liberation for the students and other sections of the people of Latin American countries."

Such anti-American, pro-Communist statements were made, and speeches delivered, throughout their trek behind the bamboo curtain. They are now back in Puerto Rico, most likely fanning the fires of anti-Americanism and encouraging other young people to join them in their battle against the United States.

Incidentally, neither had a valid passport for travel to Red China.

A group of students in the United States, under sponsorship of the Committee for Non-violent Action, are presently in Miami reportedly awaiting State Department approval for travel to Cuba. I am happy to say that, to date, this approval has not been forthcoming.

The group, in its March 20, 1964, bulletin said, however, that it would if necessary engage in "civil disobedience" in order to get to Cuba. They said: "If all reasonable efforts to secure permission from the State Department for the walk team to travel to Cuba have failed, a selected team will attempt to proceed to Cuba, using the most appropriate means of transportation available, and engaging in civil disobedience if necessary."

The group, on what it calls a "Quebec-Washington-Guantanamo peace walk," has been spending its time awaiting travel to Cuba by picketing various places in Miami.

I have here a number of photographs of the group in Florida. As can be seen from the signs they are carrying, their big push now is for the United States to get out of Vietnam.

The leader of this march group is Bradford Lyttle.

It has been reliably reported that other students active in this effort were recruited from the Young Peoples Socialist League and the Students Act for Peace group on the Florida State University campus and some of the members of these organizations are now in Miami and joining in the marchers' campaign to condemn U.S. intervention in South Vietnam.

Also tied in with this group, and a member of the Quebec-Washington-Guantanamo peace walk is one Perry Ray Robinson, Jr. Robinson has an FBI record ranging from felonious assault to possession of narcotics. He is pictured in a number of these photographs.

An insight into the future plans of these people was revealed by Mr. Scott Herrick, who is on the executive committee of the Committee for Nonviolent Action. In an interview aboard his boat, the *Mondoviano*, docked at Summerfield boatyard, Fort Lauderdale, on April 30, 1964, Herrick said that he will soon be sailing to California where he plans to round up support and money for a "peacewalk" to Red China.

He also hinted that there were other ways to get these students into Cuba if permission is not granted by the State Department.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

13903

I am not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee for Nonviolent Action is a Communist-front or Communist-sympathetic organization. Its leader is a Dr. A. J. Musto who is reportedly the world's leading pacifist.

The fact of the matter is, and as their behavior has well illustrated, organizations such as the Committee for Nonviolent Action are rapidly infiltrated by Communists and the goals of the committee are soon subverted to serve the ends of the Communist movement.

In addition, assuming these people are completely divorced from any Communist influence, the inability of the United States to protect them when they are in Cuba or Red China is reason enough to prevent them from going to these countries in the first place.

One member of the Permanent Students Committee for Travel to Cuba, while in Cuba last summer, mysteriously drowned in a hotel swimming pool. There have been persistent reports that he openly voiced his disillusionment with the Castro dictatorship and was murdered.

This brings us, Mr. Chairman, to the recent announced arrival of 75 U.S. citizens in Cuba. These people, members of the same organization that went to Cuba last summer, the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba, entered Cuba through Prague. The group's arrival in Cuba came as a complete surprise to our State Department, something that I find hard to believe.

Certainly it is unusual for 75 people who request visas to Prague to escape detection.

The group now in Cuba is led by Ed Lemansky, a self-admitted Communist.

On the day of his arrival in Cuba, in a radio interview, Lemansky said that: "The U.S. Government fears that those who return to the United States will tell publicly the truth about what goes on in Cuba. They think that if the people learn the truth about the Cuban revolution, the workers particularly will throw themselves into a struggle to attain socialism."

Apparently Mr. Lemansky knows what the truth is before seeing conditions in Cuba although viewing conditions is their ostensible purpose for going to Cuba in the first place.

Describing the Cuban revolution as "the beautiful thing that is taking place in Cuba," the students said that when they returned to this country they will spread the truth.

That this illegal trip was planned for some time is revealed by the letter from the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba of June 1, 1964.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that one need stretch his imagination to see what is going on. The Communists, expert on infiltrating well-meaning but misguided student groups, are intent on keeping the door open for travel to Cuba and other nations which it is against our national interests to recognize and to allow American citizens to travel to.

While waging their war of propaganda for the minds of our youth, they have also succeeded in exhibiting that the immigration laws presently on the books are inadequate to prevent travel to these countries.

The bill I wish to testify in behalf of today I offer in the nature of a substitute to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize, in the national interest, restrictions on travel by nationals of the United States in certain designated areas of the world.

It was over a year ago that I introduced a bill (April 1, 1963, H.R. 5320) which embraced as its objective the upholding of the sovereign's interests in imposing restrictions and prohibitions on travel to or transit through any country with which the United States does not maintain diplomatic relations, or has canceled or suspended such relations.

In the interim, I have had time for reflection upon the cases in which Communists and those who would oppose normal procedures with reference to passports have attacked and blocked and evaded the authority and prerogatives of our country in controlling transit into troubled spots on our hemisphere and throughout the world.

I have been seriously concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the fact that "in the last analysis this power rests upon the right of self-preservation, the ultimate value of any society" (and I quote from the Supreme Court opinion in *Barenblatt* back in 1959, 360 U.S. 109). There appeared there a sensitive regard, to my mind, for the right of our country to exercise vigilance and to exercise it effectively.

Alleged loopholes coupled with an inordinate stress upon the rights of an individual to come and go as he pleases even in conflict with his country's best interests have made it imperative that we adopt legislation that will close the loopholes opened by technicalities and put the stress where it belongs * * * upon the right of self-preservation of the United States properly balanced with a maximum right of travel not inconsistent therewith.

I have had the advantage of ruminating over these points with constitutional law lawyers and I want to capitalize upon their recommendations and my own experience in studying cases. My present best judgment as to how we should proceed is embodied in the bill I first offered and in the substitute amendment I offer.

The expression of legislative intent in crystal-clear terms is needed. The Supreme Court has referred to "the right to travel," though without defining this "right" in any clear way. But the Supreme Court's own holdings make it clear that there is no absolute right to travel and we can work within the doctrine of the cases.

My new draft, offered here in conjunction with my original bill, will operate to separate passport questions from the problem of controlling U.S. nationals as our national interest may require.

By separating travel restrictions from any passport question, we can remove any possibility of a successful constitutional attack on refusal of a passport to a subversive person.

The control of passports can again become, as it should be, a matter for executive discretion. Passports can be regarded once more as cards of accommodation and endorsement issued by the State Department to worthy U.S. citizens but limited as the national interest requires with adequate penalties to protect those interests when illegal travel occurs.

My proposal calls for regulation of travel, in the national interest, by the executive branch, under specific authorization by Congress.

It would be impossible to set up, by act of Congress, a scheme of operation which would envision all possible contingencies where the national interest, in the conduct of foreign affairs, might require travel restrictions. Furthermore, I have come to the conclusion that a congressional attempt, as originally proposed, to ban all travel behind the Iron Curtain and in countries not within our favor from time to time is susceptible to attack in our courts possibly on grounds of arbitrariness * * * it could be argued with some force that such a rigid ban fails to take into account all conditions at all times, for example, the right of a newspaperman to "get a story."

Such a complete ban would not solve the problem with respect to Iron Curtain countries with which we do maintain diplomatic relations and is so rigid it might even interfere with travel of our own diplomats.

We focus here upon the right of the Government, in the national interest and in the

conduct of foreign affairs, to supersede the travel desires of an individual when there is conflict between the two.

The type of statutory operation which I propose must pass the test of due process. My bill does this. The right of travel, as I have pointed out, is not an absolute right, but is a relative right, one that may be subordinate to the national interest.

The findings of the Congress, as set forth in this bill, and the Secretary of State's findings in specific cases, resting on the constitutional power of the President in controlling all foreign affairs, fulfill all the requirements of due process.

Let me implement this reasoning by quoting from the law authorities.

Chief Judge Prettyman in the *William Worthy* case in 1959 (270 F. 2d 905) treated of the Secretary of State's general policy (which I now wish to implement) of refusing Government sanction to travel by U.S. citizens in certain areas of the world, presumably under Communist control and deemed by him to be trouble spots.

Said the Chief Judge:

"Liberty itself is inherently a restricted thing. Liberty is a product of order. There is no liberty in anarchy or in chaos. Liberty is achieved by rules, which correlate every man's actions to every other man's rights and thus, by mutual restrictions one upon the other, achieve a result of relative freedom. The mere day-to-day maintenance of the order which insures liberty requires restrictions upon individual rights. Some actions, neither harmful nor potentially dangerous, must be restricted simply for the sake of good order in the community."

The circuit court of appeals concluded that the right to travel, like every other form of liberty, is, in our concept of an ordered society, subject to restrictions under some circumstances and for some reasons. *Worthy* was tried on his attempt to return to the United States without a passport.

The chief judge pointed out in that same case a potent reason why the bill I now introduce is so needed. The presence of American citizens in trouble spots on the earth's surface and the official approval of their presence in those areas will impede the execution of American foreign policy in relation both to these countries and to other countries.

By requiring a formal finding by the Secretary of State (subject always, of course, to Presidential control) and providing for publication of this finding and specific regulatory determination of travel controls, my bill meets the due process test. By reserving a measure of discretion to the Secretary, it retains essential flexibility.

A key criterion of the validity, legality, and constitutionality of the bill now introduced is to be found in the 14th paragraph of the syllabus of the February 20, 1964, decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, 238 F. 2d 386. This court, while upsetting *Worthy's* conviction of existing passport laws, concluded, however, that:

"Right of foreign travel may not be arbitrarily or unreasonably restrained but is not an absolute right, and right of Congress to require passports and to impose reasonable restrictions is not dependent on existence of state of war but may be exercised under broad power to enact legislation for regulation of foreign affairs."

The circuit court was speaking in the second *William Worthy* case and stated in its 15th paragraph of syllabus:

"Congress may punish violations of statutes imposing restrictions on right of citizens to travel in foreign countries."

Examination of my new bill will disclose, I am sure, that it embraces the very criteria of the courts themselves.

The initial bill, H.R. 5320 intends to add strength to section 125(a)(b) by making it a crime to falsely state in an application

13904

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 19

to depart or to falsely state at the time of his entry that he intends to travel or upon return that he has traveled to a restricted country and also to make it a crime to actually travel to any country with which the United States doesn't maintain diplomatic relations.

This bill is limited to national emergencies and to countries with which the United States does not maintain diplomatic relations.

H.R. 11603 is intended to supplement H.R. 5320, particularly in view of the court decisions and the difficulty of proof involved. It does not require the declaration of a national emergency, nor does it require that recognition be withdrawn in order to be operative. Thus, it gives the Secretary of State, obviously after consultation with the President, the power to determine countries or areas to which travel is restricted in the national interest and makes the actual travel there itself a crime. This avoids the constitutional and, as the Worthy case proves, the almost impossible proof burden of the intent existing before the party leaves the country. In the Worthy case, apparently the Justice Department chose to rely on the reentry rather than the leaving the country count because of the difficulty in proving intent to visit another country upon leaving.

Thus, I believe that a combination of the two bills that I have introduced will serve the best interests of the United States and still not unduly restrict travel or raise unnecessary constitutional "freedom of travel" questions.

CONGO PROSPECT

(Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, as I said 2 days ago when I inserted a letter from Monsieur Moise Tshombe in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, including an editorial from the Washington Evening Star, I am continuing to pursue my efforts in trying to discover the truth in this miserable and tragic situation.

The Star has now come out with another excellent editorial in the issue of the 18th of June 1964. Mr. Speaker, I call particular attention to the fourth paragraph in which the following statement occurs:

There is terrible irony involved here. The U.N., with the support of our Government, is responsible for having destroyed the only stable element in the Congo—President Tshombe's regime and its efficient army in Katanga, by far the richest and most orderly part of the convulsed former Belgian colony. Neither the United Nations nor the United States has reason to be proud of this; the evil consequences are still in the making.

This is the same Tshombe who was refused a visa by our State Department 2 years ago, and would probably receive the same treatment today.

CONGO PROSPECT

It is a melancholy fact that there is nothing optimistic or congratulatory to be said about the Congo Republic as it prepares to mark the fourth anniversary of its independence from Belgium. Only the Communists, particularly the Chinese, can find the prospect pleasing.

As for the free world and the Congolese themselves, it is a bad prospect at best. The news speaks for itself. With the support of Red China's "diplomats" in the neighboring land of Burundi, primitive "rebels"—including pygmies armed with little more than

spears and witch-doctor charms—have made a laughing stock of the military establishment that is supposed to uphold Premier Adoula's "central government" in Leopoldville.

This is a bleak fact of depressing importance. The Congolese army is such a completely mushy and uncertain thing, and it is so incompetently officered, that the future of the Congo seems to promise little more than bloody tribal warfare and anarchy—a period of turbulence and torment inviting a Communist takeover. The danger is both real and present. The United Nations is scheduled to withdraw all its forces from the country by the end of the month. What will be left then to hold the country together to keep provinces like Kivu and Katanga from being taken over by the "rebels" and put under Red control? Certainly a few U.S. civilians recruited by the CIA to fly reconnaissance planes over the troubled areas would not do the trick, even if they were permitted to continue operations.

There is terrible irony involved here. The U.N., with the support of our Government, is responsible for having destroyed the only stable element in the Congo—President Tshombe's regime and its efficient army in Katanga, by far the richest and most orderly part of the convulsed former Belgian colony. Neither the United Nations nor the United States has reason to be proud of this; the evil consequences are still in the making.

What will happen next? The outsider can do little more than hold his breath and guess. All one can be sure of at the moment is that the Congo remains, perhaps more than ever, a cauldron—and a prime example of how independence can be a curse when it is imposed on a people too soon, when they are woefully unready for it.

FEED GRAINS PROGRAM

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the feed grains program, now entering its fourth year, is already a \$2.5 billion dollar bust. It is too late to drop the program for 1964, but it should not be permitted to plague the taxpayers beyond this year.

According to U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates, the program cost \$2.5 billion during its first 3 years, 1961-63. In my opinion, this is a very conservative estimate.

What did the taxpayers get for their money? There are two ways to evaluate the performance of the feed grains program, and either way it comes out a costly fizzle.

First, did it cut back total production of feed grains, and if so, how much? Here the program worked in reverse. Production is up, not down. Here is the sad story of the three crops under the feed grains program, taken from U.S. Department of Agriculture reports:

[In bushels]		
Production	1960	1963
Corn.....	3,008,000,000	4,082,000,000
Barley.....	431,000,000	400,000,000
Grain sorghum.....	620,000,000	888,000,000
Total.....	4,059,000,000	5,068,000,000

Change, from 1960 to 1963: production increased 106 million bushels.

Second, did it result in a cutback in Government carryover stocks, and if so,

how much? This too is a sad story even if one assumes that the Government program was responsible for every bushel cutback in stocks.

Figures just released show that the cutback in Government stocks during this 3-year period was only 514 million bushels.

Department estimates of Government carryover stocks, all positions, at the close of the marketing year:

[In bushels]		
	1960	1963
Corn.....	2,008,000,000	1,550,000,000
Barley.....	153,000,000	140,000,000
Grain sorghum.....	703,000,000	660,000,000
Total.....	2,864,000,000	2,350,000,000

Change: Carryover down 514 million bushels.

With the program cost at \$2.5 billion, and the cutback only one-half million bushels, each bushel cutback cost the taxpayers an average of \$5, or about five times the market value of the grain.

Any fair evaluation of the program's performance must include the effect it has had on livestock prices. The Government's dumping of corn in 1961 and 1962 to get a good sign-up invited abnormally heavy livestock feeding. This, in turn, triggered today's disastrously low livestock prices. The exact price-tag of all this is impossible to fix, but it can be conservatively placed at \$3 billion.

BRUCE SAGAN AND THE INCREASING POWER OF THE COMMUNITY NEWSPAPER

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently the President of the United States and Mrs. Johnson entertained at a state dinner in the White House one of the great royal heads of Europe. It was, of course, a social and state occasion of the first order. Among the 100 guests were Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Sagan of Chicago, residents of and voters in the district that I have the honor to represent in this distinguished body. When a young couple is included in the limited invitation list to a state dinner at the White House it does not go unnoticed. Some of my colleagues, who reside miles away from my beloved Illinois, have asked me who is Bruce Sagan.

I think you will be hearing much of him in the future. He is in his early thirties, and he is part, indeed a very potent part, of a new movement in our country, as yet unnoticed by many, that will mark an increasing transfer of journalistic influence from the large daily central newspapers to the community newspapers. Mergers of large newspapers in every city of the United States have resulted in concentrating the control of journalistic influence in a few hands. Chicago is an illustration. In former years there were many newspapers published in the city of Chicago. Now there are four newspapers, a morning and an afternoon newspaper under